

Agenda Management System Vendor Questions and Answers

Updated May 16, 2011

Agenda Management RFP RFP 1127 Pre-Proposal Conference Call Transcript May 11, 2011, 11 a.m. PDT

NOTE: This will contain all vendor questions and answers, including those from the conference call and any further written questions submitted up until the May 17th deadline.

The questions and answers from the conference call are not a “word for word” transcript. They have been edited for clarity.

Conference Call Transcript

Hello! At this time I ask that all participants on this call please mute your phones unless you are speaking, in order to reduce background noise.

Welcome to the San Luis Obispo County conference call for potential vendors for the Agenda Management project, RFP #1127. My name is Phil Henry and I am a Project Manager in the Information Technology Department’s Project Management Office. I am managing this project on behalf of the County Administrative Office, County Clerk’s Office and other participating County departments.

Also attending today’s call from the County of San Luis Obispo are members of the project team who represent the key departments involved in the agenda creation and management process.

County Administrative Office – Kristi Gutierrez, Robert Cone
Clerk of the Board – Julie Rodewald
General Services Agency – Cindy Couzzi
Information Technology – Louanne Vane
Planning Department – Ramona Hedges
Public Works Department – Trisha Wright
Sheriff’s Department – Deanne Purcell

Thank you everyone for participating in today’s conference call!

The purpose of this call is to address any questions you may have about our request for proposals from potential vendors to supply, install, configure, and train county users on a new Agenda Management system.

During this conference call we want to give all participating companies an opportunity to ask questions. To facilitate this, we will randomly draw names one at a time from the list of companies who have indicated they are on this call. When your company is called, you and any subcontractors or subsidiaries may ask a question. Once all companies have had an opportunity to ask a question, we will open the floor to any company who may have additional questions.

Here is the list of companies we heard. <list was read> Did we miss anyone?

Agenda Management System Vendor Questions and Answers

Updated May 16, 2011

Please be aware that as stated in our RFP, this conference call is being recorded and we will be publishing a summary of the questions and answers from the call on our website. The website address is listed on page seven (7) of the RFP. By participating in this call, you are giving your consent to be recorded and accept that the information discussed will be published on our website afterward. However, please note that questions published on the website will not identify the names of who submitted the questions.

We will do our best to answer all questions during this call. However, there may be questions the project team will need to discuss and answer after the call. We will post all questions and answers on our website within five business days. Answers to questions received via my email address after this conference call will also be posted on our website at the discretion of San Luis Obispo County. Again, the identity of those asking questions will not be revealed.

For those on this call who did not receive an RFP directly from us and would like us to update our list of contacts with your information, please email your company name, address, phone number, and contact name to: Phil Henry, e-mail phenry@co.slo.ca.us. Please include the name of the company that forwarded our RFP to you or let us know if you found the RFP on our website.

We have a hard stop at 12 noon PDT. If we run out of time today, please send any additional questions you may have to my email address.

Before we begin, are there any questions about the process?

As there are no [further] questions regarding the process, we will proceed with the first question from...

1) **Q:** Who are the people that need to search the agendas? County employees, the public?

Clarification: Q: Are you referring to the requirement for creating text-searchable PDF files? **A:** The OCR, yes.

A: The PDFs created when the agenda is published will be posted to Granicus and will be searchable by the general public from the Granicus website. To clarify – during the agenda creation and manipulation process, the documents will be in Microsoft Office format and we're expecting that capability to be available. Once the documents are published through Granicus post-meeting processing we want them to be text searchable. Currently they are not.

2) **Q:** Can you publish the tables in the RFP appendices in a format that can be downloaded and filled out?

A: Yes, both the Requirements (Appendix B) and the Cost Proposal Table (Appendix C) have been published on the Q&A website in MS Word 2010 format. To clarify, there are two different websites for project documents. The formal RFP, and corrections/addendums will be published on the County Purchasing website. Informal project documentation, such as these questions and answers will be published on the Q&A website for vendors' convenience. Both URLs are in the RFP.

Agenda Management System Vendor Questions and Answers

Updated May 16, 2011

- 3) **Q:** Please clarify the requirement in the RFP to provide product demonstrations on-site. Is there flexibility to give an on-line demonstration instead?

Follow-up Q: Our webinars are “live” and in real-time and would be utilizing your scripts, they’d just be on our servers.

Follow-up Q: Would it be possible to allow off-site demos with a “hit” to the total number of allowable [RFP scoring] points?

A: We will take these questions off line and provide a written response.

- 4) **Q:** How heavily will local vendor preference weigh in the deciding factor?

A: The following language is taken verbatim from the County Purchasing website http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/GSA/Purchasing/Local_Vendor_Preference.htm.

*The County of San Luis Obispo has established a local vendor preference. All informal and formal Invitations to Bid and Request for Proposals for contracts will be evaluated with a 5% preference for local vendors. The vendor **must** claim local vendor preference to be considered. The form is provided within our Invitation to Bid and Request for Proposal packages. Please note the following exceptions:*

1. *Those contracts which State Law or, other law or regulation precludes this local preference.*
2. *Public Works construction projects.*

A "local" vendor will be approved as such when, 1) it conducts business in an office with a physical location within the County of San Luis Obispo; 2) it holds a valid business license issued by the County or a city within the County, and will be asked the name of the Local Agency which issued the license; and 3) business has been conducted in such a manner for not less than six (6) months prior to being able to receive the preference, you will be asked the business address and how many years the business has been at that location.

Instructions for claiming local vendor preference can be found on page 3 of the RFP.

- 5) **Q:** Is one of the intentions of your Board to utilize portable devices such as iPads to work with their agenda packets and mark up, or even internal staff to do approval of items as they are proceeding through an internal workflow?

A: The intent of the tablet device functionality is to make the complete agenda packet, including attachments, available to Board Supervisors and other key personnel. Primarily supervisors, but it could be other key county personnel – management, etc. They will be able to review and make personal notes and annotations to agenda items, both prior and during meetings, for their own use. The intent is to eliminate paper. Note that the Brown Act prohibits Supervisors from public contact (telephone, e-mail, internet, etc.) during meetings, so the devices must be able to allow download and offline annotation of the agenda items.

- 6) **Q:** For Requirement 1.5 under User Functionality – Scheduling function. Are you looking for someone to be able to track accumulated time estimate for an item to be discussed on an agenda and have someone be able to say “there’s an accumulation of six items under this section and they total 20 minutes each and so now we’re up to 2 hours and 40 minutes – is that what you’re looking for?

A: Yes, we’re looking for an accumulation of time so that we can gauge the “fullness” of the agenda. This would be for items that require reserved time such as hearings, Board business, and presentations. We don’t need to keep track of “consent” agenda items.

Agenda Management System Vendor Questions and Answers

Updated May 16, 2011

- 7) **Q:** What's acceptable to you for electronic signatures capability? Would PKI or "clickwrap" be acceptable to you? Have you sought legal counsel with regards to digital signature requirements?

A: This is described in Requirement 2.1.11 (page 42) which identifies the relevant California laws that must be adhered to for that particular functionality. This information has been provided by County Counsel. If vendors have in depth relevant experience in this area and they want to make any kind of counter-proposal or alternative suggestion (as with anything in the RFP), we're eager to seek and explore alternatives.

- 8) **Q:** How many different templates for meeting types are you looking for?

Clarification Q: Is the purpose of that question to try to address a licensing or customization issue? **A:** Customization and licensing potentially.

A: For purposes of the proposal and quotation, please plan on options for up to a dozen meeting type templates. We need to understand your costs associated for licensing and/or customization costs to provide the templates. E.g., 1-5 or 5-10, or per template, or any number of licenses are included, or if it's just a matter of the cost of doing the work up front. Per the RFP we also need to know if capability to add/modify templates is something the county can do. We need to have a clear understanding of what your system is capable of and any implications for both implementation and ongoing licensing costs, if applicable.

- 9) **Q:** Given that the county is currently involved with Granicus, if a proposal provides an additional replacement solution to Granicus, would that be a hindrance or are you interested if a vendor can do a basic "one stop shop" as opposed to dealing with additional 3rd party vendors?

A: Replacing Granicus is out-of-scope for this project. We have just recently renegotiated and extended our contract with Granicus. However, if vendors have any kind of innovative or other suggestions and alternatives, we would be interested in understanding that capability. It would not be implemented as part of this project, but in terms of the future, that would be something that we'd be interested in looking at.

- 10) **Q:** Is there an existing workflow diagram that gives any kind of overlay of the land of the type of workflow process that you're considering or the routing of agenda approval items. Is it just within the executive or are you looking for departmental routing as well?

A: There are two parts to this question.

1) Yes, we have an "as-is" workflow. We did not publish it because we're looking for a good system with workflow based on both vendor experience and best practice. The County Administrative Officer has stated that if we need to change our processes to go with best practice based on system functionality, then that's what we will do. That's the reason we didn't publish "as-is" or "to-be" processes.

2) Yes. All departments as well as County Administration and Clerk Recorder, etc., will be involved in the process. Agenda item creation begins out in the departments. Simultaneously with that, the Agenda Clerk does meeting scheduling, timeslot allocation etc. As an iterative process, you focus in on items as they're becoming complete, go through review, get approval for getting on the agenda, and so on. Somebody in all departments, the Clerk Recorder's Office, and County Administrative Office are involved in the process. That's why we have representatives from county departments on the project team.

Agenda Management System Vendor Questions and Answers

Updated May 16, 2011

11) **Q:** What would you consider your concurrent user total to be? E.g. should be quote for “enterprise” or down to user account of incremental.

A: (Post-call clarification). For planning and quotation purposes, please look at the numbers and different types of users described in the training requirements on page 10 of the RFP and quote for user-licenses accordingly. Please provide a clear explanation of your licensing model and options, e.g. cost per user, floating (simultaneous) or fixed licensing, license tiers, break-even points for “enterprise” type licensing, up front license acquisition costs, and on-going licensing costs (if applicable).

12) **Q:** What is the county looking for in reference to the requirement for Lotus Notes operability?

A: As stated in the RFP, we use Microsoft Active Directory for user accounts and authentication, and Lotus Notes/Domino is the e-mail/groupware system. The intent is to be able to use the existing Lotus Notes user and group directories to facilitate workflow in the Agenda Management system. This would include triggering notification from the system to Lotus Notes users and e-mail groups for items needing review and approval, and also sending calendar notifications and updates for upcoming meetings and agenda item slots within meetings. Although Notes is currently the groupware solution for the county, it may be replaced in the future although there are currently no plans to do so. That is the reason that this requirement is a “should” have. The county uses the Microsoft Office suite of applications for personal productivity, but does not use Outlook or Exchange.

13) **Q:** Do you have an approved budget and what would that amount be?

A: Budget has been identified for this project subject to ratification during the upcoming FY11/12 Budget Hearings.

14) **Q:** The RFP mentions OpenText as the county’s integrated document management (IDM) system and the desire to upload agenda packets into IDM. Can you describe that and what your current relationship with OpenText is and what you’re expecting from the integration between the two systems?

A: This is a “should have” requirement. IDM is the county-wide document management system. We are currently rolling out IDM to county departments and OpenText is the core of that platform along with other related products such as Enterprise Scan. The project has been under way for some time and requirements are currently being gathered for the Clerk-Recorder functionality. The intent is to upload completed agenda packets into IDM for archival purposes rather than using network shares or other means.

15) **Q:** You mention in the RFP a “go-live” date of December 30, 2011. Is the intent that you want to start out 2012 going live – what’s the intent of the date?

A: The timelines in the RFP are indicative. The go-live date is aspirational but doesn’t need to be linked to the beginning of a calendar or fiscal year. The actual rollout timescale will depend upon the successful vendor, their solution and time to configure and rollout the system, perform training, etc.

Agenda Management System Vendor Questions and Answers

Updated May 16, 2011

There were no further questions from the conference call. Vendors were reminded that they have until May 17th to submit further questions in writing per the process outlined in the RFP. These will be answered and posted in this document at the discretion of the county.

End of Conference Call

Here is the response to the queries in Question #3 above regarding the requirement to hold demonstrations on-site:

Page 6 of the RFP states “*Proposer presentations are an integral part of the selection process and proposers must be prepared in advance to present, orally and in person...*”

After further discussion, the project team has decided to adhere to this stipulation.

The project team understands the need for being cost-conscious and also understands the capabilities that technology offers in facilitating off site demonstrations. Having said that, Agenda Management is an important and high visibility project and it will impact the County Board of Supervisors and all county departments, as well as our most important stakeholders – the general public. The project team and sponsors also recognize that there is likely to be a fair amount of business process change needed to implement the new system.

The vendor demonstrations have two purposes; 1) to go through the technical capabilities of shortlisted vendor’s systems and 2) hold interactive Q&A sessions and give both vendor and county project teams a chance to meet and interact with one another. As such, these “in-person” demonstrations are an integral part of the vendor selection process and are the final step before selection and contract negotiations.

Given these factors, the project team feels that it is vital to actually meet the people who will be guiding the County through the technical and business process changes.

NOTE: The demonstration agenda and scripts will be published in a separate document on the Q&A website.

Answers to written questions submitted by the May 17th deadline will follow below
